



MORI/CDF Pages 2-4

**SECRET**

P

25X1

5 June 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: SSA-DDS

SUBJECT: Reimbursement for Retirement Travel  
Within Metropolitan Area

REFERENCE: Memo to DD/Pers fr [ ] OGC 69-1391,  
dtd 25 July 69, Subj.: Reimbursement for  
Travel and Transportation Expenses of CIARDS  
Retirees for Moves within the Metropolitan  
Washington Area

25X1

1. On 25 July 1969 this office wrote the referent opinion to the Deputy Director of Personnel, citing as authority BOB Circular No. A-56, subsection 1.3a. Actually, Circular A-56 had been modified on 26 June 1969 although the change was not circulated until August of that year. The new provision changes the definition of "post of duty" to mean "the building or other place where the officer or employee regularly reports for duty". It also states that an official station or post of duty may include "the residence or other quarters from which the employee regularly commutes to or from work". Thus, the new definition might conceivably open the way for reimbursement for transfers involving short distances within the same general locale or metropolitan area. Subparagraph 1.3a(2) of the Circular indeed does allow reimbursement for such moves when "the relocation was incident to a change of official station", taking into consideration such factors as commuting times and distances between the old and new post and his old residence and between such posts and the new residence.

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

2. While retirement is not strictly a change in official station, we have generally applied the same criteria for travel entitlements. However, the authority to travel from a post in the United States to the place of retirement is limited to participants in the CIA Retirement and Disability System as an adaptation of the Foreign Service Act. This right did not come into the Agency regulations until November 1969 although it was first provided by DDS memorandum on 30 April 1969, as approved by the Executive Director-Comptroller.

25X1 3. The Travel Policy Committee has recommended that that portion of  dealing with retirement travel be clarified so as to make moves within a metropolitan area reimbursable if directly consequent of the retirement.

4. Two cases have been presented since June of 1969, both for travel within Metropolitan Washington. The first claim for travel was denied on the basis of the referent opinion. The second has not yet been determined.

5. Taking the second case first, the employee was returned to Headquarters for retirement and his orders so stated. He took temporary quarters and stored his goods. At the time he was returned he was not certain where he would retire. It is possible to construe this situation (although it was written as two travel orders) as a return for retirement purposes to the place of retirement when selected. Thus, the equities here would dictate reimbursing the retiree for his costs incident to the retirement (i. e., moving the bulk of his goods from storage and what incidental amounts he kept with him while in temporary quarters). The first case was clearly one in which the retiree was stationed at Headquarters and moved from one location to another within the Washington area at the time of retirement. The issue of whether the move was required by the retirement was not reviewed in view of the limitation set forth in A-56. However, even with the modification of the definition of post of duty, the Agency's policy did not then include reimbursement for local moves. The Travel Policy Committee is recommending a change in this policy requiring only that the employee certify as to the connection between the move and retirement. Whether or not

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2006/10/12 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003800030005-5

this change is approved, the case first discussed above could be approved. If the change is approved, this office would perceive no legal objection to reviewing the first decision and if the move was occasioned by the retirement, reversing the referent opinion and approving the move. Finally, it would not be legally inconsistent for these two cases to be determined differently in view of their disparate facts and times.



25X1

cc: DD/Pers

-3-

**SECRET**

Approved For Release 2006/10/12 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003800030005-5